

Affirmative Action Plan for the Recruitment, Hiring, Advancement, and Retention of Persons with Disabilities

To capture agencies' affirmative action plan for persons with disabilities (PWD) and persons with targeted disabilities (PWTD), EEOC regulations (29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(e)) and MD-715 require agencies to describe how their affirmative action plan will improve the recruitment, hiring, advancement, and retention of applicants and employees with disabilities.

Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals

EEOC regulations (29 CFR §1614.203(d)(7)) require agencies to establish specific numerical goals for increasing the participation of persons with disabilities and persons with targeted disabilities in the federal government

1. Using the goal of 12% as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD by grade level cluster in the permanent workforce? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWD)

Answer No

b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWD)

Answer No

Compared to the 12 percent benchmark, the agency does not have triggers associated with IWD participation in either grade cluster of the permanent workforce. IWD participation in the GS-1 to GS-10 grade cluster of the permanent workforce is 12.68 percent. IWD participation in the GS-11 to SES grade cluster of the permanent workforce is 12.53 percent.

*For GS employees, please use two clusters: GS-1 to GS-10 and GS-11 to SES, as set forth in 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(7). For all other pay plans, please use the approximate grade clusters that are above or below GS-11 Step 1 in the Washington, DC metropolitan region.

2. Using the goal of 2% as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD by grade level cluster in the permanent workforce? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWTD)

Answer No

b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWTD)

Answer No

Compared to the 2 percent benchmark, the agency does not have triggers associated with IWTD participation in either grade cluster of the permanent workforce. IWTD participation in the GS-1 to GS-10 grade cluster of the permanent workforce is 2.32 percent. IWTD participation in the GS-11 to SES grade cluster of the permanent workforce is 2.27 percent.

Grade Level Cluster(GS or Alternate Pay Planb)	Total	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
	#	#	%	#	%
Numerical Goal	--	12%		2%	
Grades GS-1 to GS-10	44010	5582	12.68	1023	2.32
Grades GS-11 to SES	136288	17071	12.53	3090	2.27

3. Describe how the agency has communicated the numerical goals to the hiring managers and/or recruiters.

From July through October 2020, OEEO facilitated a DON-wide resurvey effort that encouraged employees to self-identify as having a disability or targeted disability. This effort stemmed from the DON IWD Champions Council, where one of its 2020 objectives was to resurvey the workforce in order to establish a better baseline for analyzing disability data. To kick-off this effort, the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), Performing the Duties of the Assistant

Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), signed a memorandum titled “Requesting Voluntary Employee Self-Identification of a Disability.” The memorandum was disseminated widely to Echelon 1 and 2 Commands (the most organizationally senior commands), as well as to the Human Resources and EEO communities. The memorandum identified DON’s responsibility to meet employment goals, and indicated that increased self-identification of a disability can help foster a greater culture of inclusion. In addition, the IWD Champions Council established an aspirational goal for the DON’s workforce to be comprised of 3 percent IWTD and 14 percent IWD, which exceeds the EEOC goals of 2 percent and 12 percent, respectively. This goal was communicated via the email containing the self-identification memorandum, which was shared with the aforementioned groups and disseminated widely to various levels of the DON. Sent along with the memorandum was the OEEEO’s Fact Sheet, “Updating Your Disability Status,” which also detailed the IWD Champions Council goal of 14 percent IWD and 3 percent IWTD.

Section II: Model Disability Program

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(1), agencies must ensure sufficient staff, training and resources to recruit and hire persons with disabilities and persons with targeted disabilities, administer the reasonable accommodation program and special emphasis program, and oversee any other disability hiring and advancement program the agency has in place.

A. PLAN TO PROVIDE SUFFICIENT & COMPETENT STAFFING FOR THE DISABILITY PROGRAM

- Has the agency designated sufficient qualified personnel to implement its disability program during the reporting period?
If “no”, describe the agency’s plan to improve the staffing for the upcoming year.

Answer No

The agency performs disability program functions utilizing a combination of full-time and part-time personnel resources. Part-time resources typically execute disability-related and/or non-disability-related functions, based on organizational priorities, as resources permit. Some regulatory requirements for disability programs, such as timeliness of reasonable accommodation requests, are not being met; therefore, some aspects of the DON Disability Program would benefit from additional qualified personnel. Additional resources for EEO have been placed into future year budget cycles.

- Identify all staff responsible for implementing the agency's disability employment program by the office, staff employment status, and responsible official.

Disability Program Task	# of FTE Staff By Employment Status			Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office Email)
	Full Time	Part Time	Collateral Duty	
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	0	0	0	Ms. Lisa Jox Director of HR Operations
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD	0	0	0	Meena Farzanfar Disability Program Manager
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	0	0	1	Meena Farzanfar Disability Program Manager
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	0	0	0	Meena Farzanfar Disability Program Manager
Section 508 Compliance	0	0	0	Christopher Julka FOIA Liaison and 508 Coordinator

Disability Program Task	# of FTE Staff By Employment Status			Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office Email)
	Full Time	Part Time	Collateral Duty	
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	0	0	0	Rear Admiral John W. Korkas Commander, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC)

3. Has the agency provided disability program staff with sufficient training to carry out their responsibilities during the reporting period? If “yes”, describe the training that disability program staff have received. If “no”, describe the training planned for the upcoming year.

Answer Yes

The agency EEO program, including Disability Program elements, are dispersed both organizationally and geographically among 23 subordinate major commands and 65 lower-level activities, each of which are managed and resourced independently by their respective component heads. If needed, Disability Program staff seeks out and attends training (e.g. DEOMI's Disability Program Management Course) in order to carry out their responsibilities.

B. PLAN TO ENSURE SUFFICIENT FUNDING FOR THE DISABILITY PROGRAM

Has the agency provided sufficient funding and other resources to successfully implement the disability program during the reporting period? If “no”, describe the agency’s plan to ensure all aspects of the disability program have sufficient funding and other resources.

Answer No

The agency EEO program, including disability program elements, are dispersed both organizationally and geographically among 23 subordinate major commands and 65 lower-level activities, each of which are managed and resourced independently by their respective component heads. Funding and other resources are executed based on organizational priorities, as resources permit. Some regulatory requirements for disability programs, such as timeliness of reasonable accommodation requests, are not being met; therefore, some aspects of the DON Disability Program would benefit from additional funding and other resources. Additional resources for EEO have been placed into future year budget cycles.

Section III: Program Deficiencies In The Disability Program

Brief Description of Program Deficiency	B.4.a.8. to effectively administer its special emphasis programs (such as, Federal Women's Program, Hispanic Employment Program, and People with Disabilities Program Manager)? [5 USC § 7201; 38 USC § 4214; 5 CFR § 720.204; 5 CFR § 213.3102(t) and (u); 5 CFR § 315.709]		
Objective	More resources are needed to timely process EEO complaints, reasonable accommodations, complete barrier analyses, and to manage its Special Emphasis Programs.		
Target Date	Sep 30, 2018		
Completion Date			
Planned Activities	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>	<u>Planned Activity</u>
	Sep 30, 2021		1. Examine DON EEO program for efficiencies by examining structure, billets, workload, and other relevant factors to increase compliance and determine appropriate level of resourcing.
Accomplishments	<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	
	2020	1. In alignment with the 2019-2030 DON Civilian Human Capital Strategy (HCS), the DON utilized contracted resources to provide an independent perspective of program organization, workflow, and other relevant factors. That effort identified and interviewed relevant stakeholders, assessed EEO practitioner workloads and assignments, and analyzed the current DON EEO Program structure and its effectiveness, with the intention of designing a recommended future state for the entire DON EEO program. Assessment efforts will continue through the beginning of FY 2021, and the effort will culminate in a final future state decision and implementation strategy later in FY 2022.	

Brief Description of Program Deficiency	C.2.a.6. Do the agency's training materials on its anti-harassment policy include examples of disability-based harassment? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(2)]		
Objective	The DON will examine and reassess its course offerings to address required elements of disability based harassment and agency training materials on its Anti- Harassment policy.		
Target Date	Sep 30, 2021		
Completion Date			
Planned Activities	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>	<u>Planned Activity</u>
Accomplishments	<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	

Brief Description of Program Deficiency	C.2.b. Has the agency established disability reasonable accommodation procedures that comply with EEOC's regulations and guidance? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(3)]		
Objective	The DON is actively working to revise the disability/reasonable accommodation procedures, with expected issuance in CY 2021.		
Target Date	Dec 31, 2021		
Completion Date			
Planned Activities	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>	<u>Planned Activity</u>
Accomplishments	<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	

Brief Description of Program Deficiency	C.2.b.5. Does the agency process all initial accommodation requests, excluding ongoing interpretative services, within the time frame set forth in its reasonable accommodation procedures? [see MD-715, II(C)] If “no”, please provide the percentage of timely-processed requests, excluding ongoing interpretative services, in the comments column.		
Objective	The agency performs disability program functions utilizing a combination of full-time and part-time personnel resources. Part-time resources typically execute disability-related and/or non-disability-related functions, based on organizational priorities, as resources permit.		
Target Date	Sep 30, 2022		
Completion Date			
Planned Activities	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>	<u>Planned Activity</u>
	Oct 1, 2021		Additional resources for EEO have been placed into future year budget cycles.
Accomplishments	<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	

Brief Description of Program Deficiency	D.1.c. Does the agency conduct exit interviews or surveys that include questions on how the agency could improve the recruitment, hiring, inclusion, retention and advancement of individuals with disabilities? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(1)(iii)(C)]		
--	---	--	--

Section IV: Plan to Recruit and Hire Individuals with Disabilities

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(d)(1)(i) and (ii), agencies must establish a plan to increase the recruitment and hiring of individuals with disabilities. The questions below are designed to identify outcomes of the agency’s recruitment program plan for PWD and PWTD

A. PLAN TO IDENTIFY JOB APPLICATIONS WITH DISABILITIES

1. Describe the programs and resources the agency uses to identify job applicants with disabilities, including individuals with targeted disabilities.

The DON utilizes the Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP) as a recruitment source to bring on students and recent graduates with disabilities on a temporary and permanent basis. The WRP database contains the largest pool of Schedule A(u)-eligible candidates to recruit from, and is refreshed with new candidates each year. The DoD provides its components, to include the DON, with funding to fill a limited number of 14-week placements. In FY 2020, the DON overcame significant program challenges to facilitate the employment of 22 participants in temporary opportunities, and 10 permanent placements. The DON’s subordinate components conduct various recruiting efforts to identify job applicants with disabilities and with targeted disabilities, to varying degrees of success. These efforts include attending job fairs, as well as leveraging relationships with vocational rehabilitation agencies and relevant colleges/universities to identify potential candidates.

2. Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(a)(3), describe the agency’s use of hiring authorities that take disability into account (e.g., Schedule A) to recruit PWD and PWTD for positions in the permanent workforce

DON’s major commands leverage available hiring flexibilities (to include the 30 percent or more Disabled Veteran, Schedule A(u), and Veterans’ Recruitment Appointment (VRA)), as well as various recruitment sources (e.g. Wounded Warrior programs, WRP, etc.) in order to identify the most suitable candidate to meet workforce needs. According to DON FY 2020 data, 6 percent of new hires were hired through the 30 percent or more Disabled Veteran hiring authority (up from 1.3 percent in FY 2019), and 7 percent were hired through the Schedule A(u) hiring authority (up from 1.7 percent in FY 2019).

3. When individuals apply for a position under a hiring authority that takes disability into account (e.g., Schedule A), explain how the agency (1) determines if the individual is eligible for appointment under such authority; and, (2) forwards the individual's application to the relevant hiring officials with an explanation of how and when the individual may be appointed.

The DON utilizes hiring authorities that take disability into account as an Area of Consideration (AOC) in vacancy announcements. When it is included as an AOC, and applicants apply for a relevant position through www.USAJobs.gov and want to exercise their eligibility for one of these authorities, they self-certify their eligibility while completing the questionnaire, and provide proof of eligibility (e.g. with Schedule A(u) letter or U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs disability rating letter, etc.) before submitting their application. The HR Specialist then evaluates the sufficiency of the documentation, and if deemed sufficient and the candidate is deemed qualified for the position, the candidate may be added to the certificate of eligible candidates, which is provided to the hiring manager.

4. Has the agency provided training to all hiring managers on the use of hiring authorities that take disability into account (e.g., Schedule A)? If “yes”, describe the type(s) of training and frequency. If “no”, describe the agency’s plan to provide this training.

Answer Yes

Supervisors are required to take Supervisory EEO Training and “Hiring Talent” training, which are computer-based courses in TWMS. The Supervisory EEO Training is required to be taken within 1 year of initial appointment to a supervisory position, with a refresher taken at least every 3 years thereafter. The IWD Program section of this training describes the Schedule A(u) hiring authority, indicates that candidates may be found through vocational rehabilitation agencies and the WRP, and informs hiring managers that a best practice is to have qualified Schedule A(u) candidates prior to putting in a Request for Personnel Action (RPA), and to include People with Disabilities as an AOC on the vacancy announcement. The “Hiring Talent” training is required to be taken within 1 year of initial appointment to a supervisory position, and every year thereafter. This training has its own section on Hiring People with Disabilities. Information on VRA and 30 percent or more Disabled Veteran (including Wounded Warriors) are included in the “Hiring Veterans” section of this training. In addition to the training above, the DON’s subordinate components also facilitate additional component-specific supervisory training requirements pertaining to Disability Program priorities and hiring flexibilities.

B. PLAN TO ESTABLISH CONTACTS WITH DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Describe the agency’s efforts to establish and maintain contacts with organizations that assist PWD, including PWTD, in securing and maintaining employment.

The DON’s subordinate components have established and/or maintained contacts to varying degrees with various disability employment organizations, and especially Wounded Warriors organizations. The DON actively promotes and utilizes the WRP, which is a Federal government-wide recruitment and referral program managed by the Department of Labor and DoD that connects the DON’s hiring managers with qualified candidates with disabilities for temporary and permanent positions. This database contains candidates from hundreds of colleges and universities across the country.

C. PROGRESSION TOWARDS GOALS (RECRUITMENT AND HIRING)

1. Using the goals of 12% for PWD and 2% for PWTD as the benchmarks, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the new hires in the permanent workforce? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below.

a. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWD) Answer Yes

b. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWTD) Answer Yes

The permanent workforce hire percentage for IWD within the appropriated fund workforce is 5.5 percent (which is lower than the 12 percent benchmark). The permanent workforce hire percentage for IWTD within the permanent workforce is 1.1 percent (which is lower than the 2 percent benchmark).

New Hires	Total (#)	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
		Permanent Workforce (%)	Temporary Workforce (%)	Permanent Workforce (%)	Temporary Workforce (%)

% of Total Applicants	31386	9.35	0.00	3.62	0.00
% of Qualified Applicants	16682	9.17	0.00	3.43	0.00
% of New Hires	694	5.33	0.00	1.59	0.00

2. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the new hires for any of the mission- critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. New Hires for MCO (PWD) Answer Yes

b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD) Answer Yes

Occupational series 0301, 0343, 0346, 0501, 0801, 0830, 1102, and 2210 have triggers for both IWD and IWTD.

New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations	Total (#)	Reportable Disability		Targetable Disability	
		Qualified Applicants (%)	New Hires (%)	Qualified Applicants (%)	New Hires (%)
Numerical Goal	--	12%		2%	
0301MISC. ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM	53	375.47	7.55	130.19	1.89
0343MANAGEMENT PROGRAM ANALYSIS	53	409.43	11.32	139.62	3.77
0346LOGISTICS MANAGEMENT	25	388.00	0.00	160.00	0.00
0501FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION AND PROGRAM	50	298.00	10.00	88.00	2.00
0801GENERAL ENGINEERING	15	126.67	60.00	40.00	0.00
0802ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN	42	140.48	7.14	52.38	2.38
0830MECHANICAL ENGINEERING	20	80.00	0.00	20.00	0.00
0855ELECTRONICS ENGINEERING	9	166.67	66.67	77.78	33.33
1102CONTRACTING	140	25.00	0.00	9.29	0.00
2210INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3. Using the relevant applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the qualified internal applicants for any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWD) Answer Yes

b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD) Answer Yes

All MCOs (Occupational Series 0301, 0343, 0346, 0501, 0801, 0802, 0830, 0855, 1102, and 2210) have triggers for both IWD and IWTD.

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among employees promoted to any of the mission- critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Promotions for MCO (PWD)

Answer Yes

b. Promotions for MCO (PWTD)

Answer Yes

Occupational Series 0301, 0343, 0346, 0501, 0801, 1102 and 2210 have triggers that exist for both IWD and IWTD. For Occupational Series 0802 and 0855, triggers exist for IWTD, but not for IWD.

Section V: Plan to Ensure Advancement Opportunities for Employees with Disabilities

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(d)(1)(iii), agencies are required to provide sufficient advancement opportunities for employees with disabilities. Such activities might include specialized training and mentoring programs, career development opportunities, awards programs, promotions, and similar programs that address advancement. In this section, agencies should identify, and provide data on programs designed to ensure advancement opportunities for employees with disabilities.

A. ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM PLAN

Describe the agency’s plan to ensure PWD, including PWTD, have sufficient opportunities for advancement.

The DON offers and seeks applications for a multitude of advancement opportunities, where all eligible candidates are encouraged to apply. Some of the DON’s subcomponents offer and administer advancement opportunities, where IWD and IWTD could be considered.

B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

1. Please describe the career development opportunities that the agency provides to its employees.

The DON offers and seeks applications for a multitude of advancement opportunities, where all eligible candidates are encouraged to apply. Some of the DON’s subcomponents offer and administer advancement opportunities, where IWD and IWTD could be considered.

2. In the table below, please provide the data for career development opportunities that require competition and/or supervisory recommendation/ approval to participate.

Career Development Opportunities	Total Participants		PWD		PWTD	
	Applicants (#)	Selectees (#)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)
Internship Programs						
Detail Programs						
Fellowship Programs						
Other Career Development Programs						
Mentoring Programs						
Coaching Programs						

Career Development Opportunities	Total Participants		PWD		PWTD	
	Applicants (#)	Selectees (#)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)
Training Programs						

3. Do triggers exist for PWD among the applicants and/or selectees for any of the career development programs? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for the applicants and the applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Applicants (PWD) Answer No

b. Selections (PWD) Answer No

The agency does not maintain relevant data on career development opportunities; thus, the presence of triggers cannot be assessed.

4. Do triggers exist for PWTD among the applicants and/or selectees for any of the career development programs? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for the applicants and the applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Applicants (PWTD) Answer No

b. Selections (PWTD) Answer No

The agency does not maintain relevant data on career development opportunities; thus, the presence of triggers cannot be assessed.

C. AWARDS

1. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD and/or PWTD for any level of the time-off awards, bonuses, or other incentives? If “yes”, please describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWD) Answer Yes

b. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWTD) Answer Yes

There are triggers for both IWD and IWTD in Time off Awards of 40+ hours, Cash Awards of \$500 and under, and Cash Awards of \$2000 - \$5000+. There are triggers for IWD in Time Off Awards of 1-10 hours and Cash Awards of \$501-\$1999.

Time-Off Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given	43513	14.65	17.74	18.90	13.67
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Total Hours	281751	98.27	114.17	129.37	91.09
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Average Hours	6.48	0.02	0.00	0.13	0.00
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given	13468	5.66	5.22	5.79	5.63
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours	209960	89.09	81.06	92.78	88.23
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours	15.59	0.06	0.01	0.30	0.00
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given	7755	3.71	2.92	3.48	3.77

Time-Off Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours	185489	88.45	69.78	83.69	89.55
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours	23.92	0.08	0.01	0.45	0.00
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given	8042	3.63	3.03	4.08	3.52
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours	299188	135.53	112.68	150.71	132.03
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours	37.2	0.13	0.02	0.69	0.00
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Awards Given	50	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.01
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Total Hours	2613	0.51	1.13	0.00	0.62
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Average Hours	52.26	0.17	0.03	0.00	0.21

Cash Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Awards Given	77835	26.55	31.76	32.19	25.25
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Total Amount	56227585	19473.88	22944.38	23443.48	18557.10
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Average Amount	722.39	2.59	0.36	13.69	0.02
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Awards Given	63772	22.63	26.53	26.89	21.65
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Total Amount	83972789	30043.81	34923.95	35525.29	28777.87
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Average Amount	1316.77	4.68	0.66	24.83	0.03
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Awards Given	14413	5.06	6.03	5.64	4.92
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Total Amount	33447605	11902.93	13968.22	13066.69	11634.16
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Average Amount	2320.66	8.30	1.16	43.56	0.16
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Awards Given	4208	1.26	1.81	1.26	1.26
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Total Amount	13857894	4210.19	5954.75	4223.54	4207.10
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Average Amount	3293.23	11.76	1.65	63.04	-0.08
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Awards Given	1723	0.44	0.77	0.66	0.39
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Total Amount	7487910	1941.84	3335.58	2783.62	1747.44
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Average Amount	4345.86	15.41	2.18	79.53	0.60
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Awards Given	1857	0.47	0.83	0.54	0.45
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Total Amount	12624247	3290.99	5640.92	3681.62	3200.78
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Average Amount	6798.19	24.93	3.41	126.95	1.37

Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD and/or PWTD for quality step increases or performance-based pay increases? If “yes”, please describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Pay Increases (PWD) Answer Yes

b. Pay Increases (PWTD) Answer Yes

There are triggers for both IWD and IWT in quality step increases. There is a trigger for IWD in performance-based pay increases.

Other Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Total Performance Based Pay Increases Awarded	39419	13.48	16.56	16.85	12.70

3. If the agency has other types of employee recognition programs, are PWD and/or PWTD recognized disproportionately less than employees without disabilities? (The appropriate benchmark is the inclusion rate.) If “yes”, describe the employee recognition program and relevant data in the text box.

a. Other Types of Recognition (PWD) Answer No

b. Other Types of Recognition (PWTD) Answer No

The DON currently does not have data on other types of employee recognition programs.

D. PROMOTIONS

1. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to the senior grade levels? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. SES

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

b. Grade GS-15

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

c. Grade GS-14

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

d. Grade GS-13

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

The agency has multiple relevant triggers involving IWD: a. For the SES level, only 2.08 percent of qualified internal applicants identified as IWD, compared to nearly 9 percent in the relevant applicant pool, and 0 percent of selectees identified as IWD,

compared to 2.08 percent in the qualified applicant pool. b. For the GS-15 level, only 4.24 percent of qualified internal applicants identified as IWD, compared to 9.63 percent in the relevant applicant pool, and only 0.52 percent of selectees identified as IWD, compared to 4.24 percent in the qualified applicant pool. c. For the GS-14 level, only 4.46 percent of qualified internal applicants identified as IWD, compared to 9.82 percent in the relevant applicant pool, and only 1.43 percent of selectees identified as IWD, compared to 4.46 percent in the qualified applicant pool. d. For the GS-13 level, only 6.11 percent of qualified internal applicants identified as IWD, compared to 11.99 percent in the relevant applicant pool, and only 2.75 percent of selectees identified as IWD, compared to 6.11 percent in the qualified applicant pool.

2. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTB among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to the senior grade levels? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. SES

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer Yes

b. Grade GS-15

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer Yes

c. Grade GS-14

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer Yes

d. Grade GS-13

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) Answer No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer Yes

The agency has multiple triggers involving IWTB among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to senior grade levels: a. For the SES level, 0 percent of qualified internal applicants identified as IWTB, compared to 1.8 percent in the relevant applicant pool. b. For the GS-15 level, only 1.95 percent of qualified internal applicants identified as IWTB, compared to 2.06 percent in the relevant applicant pool, and 0 percent of selectees identified as IWTB, compared to 1.95 percent in the qualified applicant pool. c. For the GS-14 level, only 1.81 percent of qualified internal applicants identified as IWTB, compared to 2.18 percent in the relevant applicant pool, and only 0.41 percent of selectees identified as IWTB, compared to 1.81 percent in the qualified applicant pool. d. For the GS-13 level, while 3.09 percent of qualified internal applicants identified as IWTB, compared to 2.59 percent in the relevant applicant pool, only 1.06 percent of selectees identified as IWTB, compared to 3.09 percent in the qualified applicant pool.

3. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWB among the new hires to the senior grade levels? For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. New Hires to SES (PWB) Answer Yes

b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWB) Answer Yes

c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWB) Answer Yes

d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWD)

Answer Yes

Among qualified new hire applicants, 4.72 percent of SES, 3.72 percent of GS-15, and 5.65 percent of GS-13 identified as IWD; however, none were selected. Similarly, 5.96 percent of qualified new hire applicants to GS-14 identified as IWD; however, only 2.63 percent were selected. The selection rate for applicants who identified as IWD to all four grade levels fell short of the corresponding combined selection rate for applicants within the No Disability and Not Identified categories.

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the new hires to the senior grade levels? For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. New Hires to SES (PWTD)

Answer Yes

b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWTD)

Answer Yes

c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWTD)

Answer Yes

d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWTD)

Answer Yes

Among qualified new hire applicants, 3.14 percent of SES, 1.86 percent of GS-15, 2.27 percent of GS-14, and 2.94 percent of GS-13 identified as IWD; however, none were selected. The selection rate for applicants who identified as IWD to all four grade levels fell short of the corresponding combined selection rate for applicants within the No Disability and Not Identified categories.

5. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Executives

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)

Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWD)

Answer Yes

b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)

Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWD)

Answer Yes

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)

Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWD)

Answer No

With respect to Executive positions, 8.52 percent of applicants were IWD; however, only 4.11 percent of those qualified were IWD, and none of those selected were IWD. For Manager positions, 9.79 percent of applicants were IWD; however, only 5.73 percent of those qualified were IWD, and only 2.22 percent of those selected were IWD. For Supervisory positions, 11.99 percent of applicants were IWD, however only 6.74 percent of those qualified were IWD.

6. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Executives

- | | | |
|---|--------|-----|
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) | Answer | No |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) | Answer | Yes |

b. Managers

- | | | |
|---|--------|-----|
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) | Answer | No |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) | Answer | Yes |

c. Supervisors

- | | | |
|---|--------|-----|
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) | Answer | No |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) | Answer | Yes |

With respect to Executive positions, 1.8 percent of applicants were IWTB. While 2.37 percent of those qualified were IWTB, none were selected. For Manager positions, 2.16 percent of applicants were IWTB. While 2.78 percent of those qualified were IWTB, none were selected. For Supervisory positions, 2.99 percent of applicants were IWTB. While 3.47 percent of those qualified were IWTB, only 3.45 percent of those were selected.

7. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------|-----|
| a. New Hires for Executives (PWD) | Answer | Yes |
| b. New Hires for Managers (PWD) | Answer | Yes |
| c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD) | Answer | Yes |

With respect to Executive positions, 4.11 percent of those qualified were IWD, and none were selected. For Manager positions, 5.73 percent of those qualified were IWD, and none were selected. For Supervisory positions, 11.99 percent of those qualified were IWD; however, only 5.58 percent of those were qualified.

8. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------|-----|
| a. New Hires for Executives (PWTD) | Answer | Yes |
| b. New Hires for Managers (PWTD) | Answer | Yes |
| c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD) | Answer | No |

With respect to Executive positions, 2.37 percent of those qualified were IWD, and none of those selected were IWD. For Manager positions, 2.78 percent of those qualified were IWD, and none of those selected were IWD.

Section VI: Plan to Improve Retention of Persons with Disabilities

To be model employer for persons with disabilities, agencies must have policies and programs in place to retain employees with disabilities. In this section, agencies should: (1) analyze workforce separation data to identify barriers retaining employees with disabilities; (2) describe efforts to ensure accessibility of technology and facilities; and (3) provide information on the reasonable accommodation program and workplace assistance services.

A. VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS

1. In this reporting period, did the agency convert all eligible Schedule A employees with a disability into the competitive service after two years of satisfactory service (5 C.F.R. § 213.3102(u)(6)(i))? If “no”, please explain why the agency did not convert all eligible Schedule A employees.

Answer Yes

During the reporting period, 91 employees appointed via the Schedule A(u) hiring authority were not converted at the conclusion of the two year probationary period. In FY 2021, the DON will analyze additional data to discern why it did not convert all employees who were appointed via the Schedule A(u) hiring authority to competitive service at the conclusion of the probationary period.

2. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, did the percentage of PWD among voluntary and involuntary separations exceed that of persons without disabilities? If “yes”, describe the trigger below.

a. Voluntary Separations (PWD)

Answer Yes

b. Involuntary Separations (PWD)

Answer No

Voluntary separations of IWD exceeded those of non-IWD by 1.52 percent.

Seperations	Total #	Reportable Disabilities %	Without Reportable Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	0	0.00	0.00

3. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, did the percentage of PWTD among voluntary and involuntary separations exceed that of persons without targeted disabilities? If “yes”, describe the trigger below.

a. Voluntary Separations (PWTD)

Answer Yes

b. Involuntary Separations (PWTD)

Answer No

Voluntary separations of IWTD exceeded those of non-IWTD by 2.55 percent.

Seperations	Total #	Targeted Disabilities %	Without Targeted Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	0	0.00	0.00

4. If a trigger exists involving the separation rate of PWD and/or PWTD, please explain why they left the agency using exit interview results and other data sources.

DON does not centrally conduct or collect exit interview or exit survey results; however, some subordinate components conduct and/or collect this information locally. Preliminary analysis does not identify any systemic or consistent reasons for IWD and/or IWTD to separate from the DON.

B. ACCESSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES

Pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(4), federal agencies are required to inform applicants and employees of their rights under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 794(b), concerning the accessibility of agency technology, and the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. § 4151-4157), concerning the accessibility of agency facilities. In addition, agencies are required to inform individuals where to file complaints if other agencies are responsible for a violation.

1. Please provide the internet address on the agency's public website for its notice explaining employees' and applicants' rights under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, including a description of how to file a complaint.

<https://www.secnave.navy.mil/mra/eo/Pages/Accessibility-of-IT-and-Facilities.aspx>

2. Please provide the internet address on the agency's public website for its notice explaining employees' and applicants' rights under the Architectural Barriers Act, including a description of how to file a complaint.

<https://www.secnave.navy.mil/mra/eo/Pages/Accessibility-of-IT-and-Facilities.aspx>

3. Describe any programs, policies, or practices that the agency has undertaken, or plans on undertaking over the next fiscal year, designed to improve accessibility of agency facilities and/or technology.

The DON works to expeditiously resolve formal Architectural Barriers Act and Section 508 complaints as they are referred by DoD and the U.S. Access Board for processing. In addition, the DON regularly processes requests for and provides reasonable accommodations for modifications within the work environment that involve physical and electronic accessibility. As part of the DON's Accessibility Policy Statement, the DON OEO serves as the point of contact for addressing accessibility concerns for agency facilities and technology, and will better understand the state of the DON's overall accessibility after analyzing the incoming inquiries. Based on the trends derived from this information, the DON can plan to eliminate certain barriers to accessibility in future years. In 2020, the IWD Champions Council established the objective of enhancing the accessibility of information technology (IT) and electronic documents, and the objective of enhancing the accessibility of physical infrastructure and DON facilities. As part of the Council's efforts, the DON OEO authored and issued a Fact Sheet in April 2020 titled "Section 508: Creating Accessible Documents." This Fact Sheet describes the importance of document accessibility, explains how to run Accessibility Checkers in frequently-used electronic file formats (Microsoft Word, PowerPoint, Excel, Adobe PDF, etc.), and provides additional resources for ensuring Section 508 compliance and document accessibility. The execution of additional efforts toward these two objectives have been planned for FY 2021. The DON heavily utilizes the DoD's Computer/Electronic Accommodations Program (CAP) to provide reasonable accommodations in the form of assistive technology. In FY 2020, CAP provided the DON workforce and service members with a total of 1,305 accommodations costing \$351,438.59. The DON has a strong team that meets weekly to execute a unique process to ensure that the CAP offerings are compatible and are approved for use on the Navy/Marine Corps Intranet (NMCI). This team continually reviews CAP's offerings, identifies the latest versions of assistive technologies, and procures those products for risk-assessment, compatibility testing, and approval on the NMCI network to ensure 508 compliance. The DON Program Manager for CAP Assistive Technologies troubleshoots any issues with user software if the software was obtained through CAP, and follows up with the appropriate parties to ensure expeditious resolution, so that individuals who rely on assistive technology can fully perform their job duties.

C. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION PROGRAM

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(3), agencies must adopt, post on their public website, and make available to all job applicants and employees, reasonable accommodation procedures.

1. Please provide the average time frame for processing initial requests for reasonable accommodations during the reporting period. (Please do not include previously approved requests with repetitive accommodations, such as interpreting services.)

The DON utilizes the Navy Electronic Accommodations Tracker (NEAT) to collect reasonable accommodation (RA) data, which is a database system that DON's EEO offices use to document their efforts and milestones in processing requests for RA. OEO manages NEAT and has administrative oversight of RA processing in the database. The data in NEAT shows that the DON processed 2,041 requests for disability accommodations in FY 2020 (not including those for recurring requests), taking an average

of 38.57 days for the requests to be processed. DON's Procedures for Processing Requests for Reasonable Accommodation require that reasonable accommodation requests be processed (from initial request to decision of whether to accommodate) within 30 calendar days. Therefore, the DON's average processing time is longer than the timeframe prescribed in DON policy. In FY 2021, OEEEO will examine barriers to processing RA requests in a timely manner, and work to address any identified barriers. Please see Section VII of the Part J.

2. Describe the effectiveness of the policies, procedures, or practices to implement the agency's reasonable accommodation program. Some examples of an effective program include timely processing requests, timely providing approved accommodations, conducting training for managers and supervisors, and monitoring accommodation requests for trends.

The agency EEO Program, including disability program elements, are dispersed both organizationally and geographically among 23 subordinate major commands and 65 lower-level activities, each of which are managed and resourced independently by their respective component heads. Some of the DON's subordinate components have issued additional reasonable accommodation guidance, in addition to the DON's Procedures for Processing Requests for Reasonable Accommodation. The DON's subordinate components executed their reasonable accommodation programs to varying degrees of success. Training was delivered on reasonable accommodation at the majority of the commands, and is also included in the mandatory Supervisory EEO Training course.

D. PERSONAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES ALLOWING EMPLOYEES TO PARTICIPATE IN THE WORKPLACE

Pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(5), federal agencies, as an aspect of affirmative action, are required to provide personal assistance services (PAS) to employees who need them because of a targeted disability, unless doing so would impose an undue hardship on the agency.

Describe the effectiveness of the policies, procedures, or practices to implement the PAS requirement. Some examples of an effective program include timely processing requests for PAS, timely providing approved services, conducting training for managers and supervisors, and monitoring PAS requests for trends.

The DON issued a policy statement and Procedures for Processing Requests for Personal Assistance Services (PAS) on January 23, 2018. In FY 2020, the functionality to capture PAS requests in NEAT was implemented, so that the DON is able to evaluate trends and the effectiveness of the program. In FY 2020, the DON processed 3 PAS requests. Additionally, DON's mandatory Supervisory EEO Training includes a module that outlines the DON's obligation to provide PAS to those who need the services because of their targeted disability, defines PAS, distinguishes between PAS and reasonable accommodation, and refers to the DON's PAS procedures for more information.

Section VII: EEO Complaint and Findings Data

A. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING HARASSMENT

1. During the last fiscal year, did a higher percentage of PWD file a formal EEO complaint alleging harassment, as compared to the governmentwide average?

Answer No
2. During the last fiscal year, did any complaints alleging harassment based on disability status result in a finding of discrimination or a settlement agreement?

Answer No
3. If the agency had one or more findings of discrimination alleging harassment based on disability status during the last fiscal year, please describe the corrective measures taken by the agency.

The DON did not have any findings of discrimination alleging harassment based on disability status.

B. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION

1. During the last fiscal year, did a higher percentage of PWD file a formal EEO complaint alleging failure to provide a reasonable accommodation, as compared to the government-wide average?

Answer No

2. During the last fiscal year, did any complaints alleging failure to provide reasonable accommodation result in a finding of discrimination or a settlement agreement?

Answer Yes

3. If the agency had one or more findings of discrimination involving the failure to provide a reasonable accommodation during the last fiscal year, please describe the corrective measures taken by the agency.

The DON had one finding of discrimination involving the failure to provide a reasonable accommodation, where the corrective measures taken by the agency were as follows: awarded the complainant \$5,000 for non-pecuniary damages and \$15,475 in attorney fees, and provided EEO and Reasonable Accommodation training to the Responsible Management Officials.

Section VIII: Identification and Removal of Barriers

Element D of MD-715 requires agencies to conduct a barrier analysis when a trigger suggests that a policy, procedure, or practice may be impeding the employment opportunities of a protected EEO group.

1. Has the agency identified any barriers (policies, procedures, and/or practices) that affect employment opportunities for PWD and/or PWTD?

Answer Yes

2. Has the agency established a plan to correct the barrier(s) involving PWD and/or PWTD?

Answer Yes

3. Identify each trigger and plan to remove the barrier(s), including the identified barrier(s), objective(s), responsible official(s), planned activities, and, where applicable, accomplishments

4. Please explain the factor(s) that prevented the agency from timely completing any of the planned activities.

The accomplishment of planned activities is still underway. The impact of the activities toward eliminating barriers will be assessed in the FY 2021 MD-715.

5. For the planned activities that were completed, please describe the actual impact of those activities toward eliminating the barrier(s).

The accomplishment of planned activities is still underway. The impact of the activities toward eliminating barriers will be assessed in the FY 2021 MD-715.

6. If the planned activities did not correct the trigger(s) and/or barrier(s), please describe how the agency intends to improve the plan for the next fiscal year.

The accomplishment of planned activities is still underway. The impact of the activities toward eliminating barriers will be assessed in the FY 2021 MD-715.